arXiv:1612.06700v1 [math.HO] 13 Dec 2016

Revisiting Eisenstein-type criterion over integers

Akash Jena* Binod Kumar Sahoo

School of Mathematical Sciences
National Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhubaneswar
HBNI, P.O.- Jatni, Dist- Khurda, Odisha - 752050, India
Emails: akash.jena@niser.ac.in, bksahoo@niser.ac.in

Abstract

The following result, a consequence of Dumas criterion for irreducibility of polynomials over integers, is generally proved using the notion of Newton diagram:

> "Let $f(x)$ be a polynomial with integer coefficients and k be a positive integer relatively prime to $\deg f(x)$. Suppose that there exists a prime number p such that the leading coefficient of $f(x)$ is not divisible by p, all the remaining coefficients are divisible by p^k, and the constant term of $f(x)$ is not divisible by p^{k+1}. Then $f(x)$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Z}$".

For $k = 1$, this is precisely the Eisenstein criterion. The aim of this article is to give an alternate proof, accessible to the undergraduate students, of this result for $k \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ using basic divisibility properties of integers.

Keywords: Irreducible polynomial, Eisenstein criterion, Dumas criterion, Newton diagram

*The author is a final year student of the Integrated M.Sc. program in Mathematics. He is a recipient of INSPIRE student fellowship awarded by the Department of Science and Technology, Government of India.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ be the ring of polynomials with coefficients from the ring $\mathbb{Z}$ of integers. A nonconstant polynomial $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ is said to be *reducible* over $\mathbb{Z}$ if it can be written as a product of two nonconstant polynomials in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$, otherwise, $f(x)$ is called *irreducible* over $\mathbb{Z}$. There is no universal criterion which can be applied to determine the reducibility/irreducibility of all the polynomials in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$. However, many criteria exist in the literature each of which give this information for some particular class of polynomials. One such criterion, the so called "Eisenstein criterion", is due to Gotthold Eisenstein (1823–1852), a German mathematician. This is perhaps the most well-known criterion which gives a sufficient condition for a polynomial in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ to be irreducible.

> *Eisenstein criterion.* Let $f(x)$ be a polynomial in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ of positive degree. Suppose that there exists a prime number p such that the leading coefficient of $f(x)$ is not divisible by p, all the remaining coefficients are divisible by p, and the constant term is not divisible by p^2. Then $f(x)$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Z}$.

A polynomial satisfying the conditions of Eisenstein criterion for some prime is called an *Eisenstein polynomial*. In practice, it may happen that the original polynomial $f(x)$ is not Eisenstein for any prime, but the criterion is applicable (with respect to some prime) to the polynomial obtained after transforming $f(x)$ by some substitution for x. The fact that the polynomial after substitution is irreducible then allows to conclude that the original polynomial itself is irreducible.

As mentioned in [4, p.49], one can reverse the roles of the constant term and the leading coefficient of $f(x)$ to get another version of the Eisenstein criterion. More precisely, *if the constant term of $f(x)$ is not divisible by p, all the remaining coefficients are divisible by p, and the leading coefficient of $f(x)$ is not divisible by p^2, then $f(x)$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Z}$.*

We learn Eisenstein criterion generally at the undergraduate level as a part of our mathematics training. At that time, realizing its power and simplicity, students try to generalize the statement of the criterion and ask the following natural question:

> Suppose that there exists a prime number p and an integer $k \geq 2$ such that the leading coefficient of $f(x)$ is not divisible by p, all the remaining coefficients are divisible by p^k, and the constant term is not divisible by p^{k+1}. Is $f(x)$ necessarily irreducible over $\mathbb{Z}$?

The answer is certainly No!. For example, one can have the following factorizations:

$$x^2 - p^2 = (x-p)(x+p), \;\; x^3 - p^3 = (x-p)(x^2+px+p^2), \text{ etc.}$$

However, the answer could be affirmative if one adds an extra condition connecting k and the degree of $f(x)$, see Theorem 1.2 below.

1.1 Dumas Criterion

The second best known irreducibility criterion based on divisibility of the coefficients by a prime is probably the so called "Dumas Criterion", due to Gustave Dumas (1872–1955), a Swiss mathematician. To state this criterion, it is necessary to recall the notion of 'Newton diagram' of a polynomial over integers with respect to a given prime number.

Let p be a fixed prime number and let $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be a polynomial of degree $n \geq 1$. We refer to [3, Sec. 2.2.1] or [2, Page 96] for the construction of the Newton diagram of $f(x)$ with respect to p. Let

$$f(x) = a_n x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0,$$

where the constant term a_0 is nonzero (otherwise, $f(x)$ would be reducible for $n \geq 2$). Every nonzero coefficient a_i of $f(x)$ can be written in the form

$$a_i = \bar{a}_i p^{\alpha_i},$$

where $\bar{a}_i$ is an integer not divisible by p, that is, α_i is the maximum power of p such that $p^{\alpha_i} \mid a_i$. Set

$$X = \{(i, \alpha_i) : a_i \neq 0\},$$

call the elements of X as vertices and plot them in the plane. Since $f(x)$ is of positive degree, there are at least two vertices: the *initial* vertex $(0, \alpha_0)$ and the *terminal* vertex (n, α_n). Note that there is no vertex corresponding to a zero coefficient of $f(x)$. The construction of the *Newton diagram of* $f(x)$ *with respect to* p is as follows.

Start with the initial vertex $v_0 = (0, \alpha_0)$. Then find the vertex $v_1 = (i_1, \alpha_{i_1})$, where $i_1 \neq 0$ is the largest integer for which there is no vertex of X below the line through v_0 and v_1. It may happen that the line segment v_0v_1 joining v_0 and v_1 contain vertices from X which are different from v_0 and v_1. Then find the vertex $v_2 = (i_2, \alpha_{i_2})$, where i_2 $(\neq i_1)$ is the largest integer for which there is no vertex below the line through v_1 and v_2. Proceed in

this way to draw the line segments v_0v_1, v_1v_2 etc. one by one. The very last line segment is of the form $v_{k-1}v_k$, where $v_k = (n, \alpha_n)$ is the terminal vertex. Then the Newton diagram of $f(x)$ with respect to p consists of the line segments $v_{j-1}v_j$, $1 \leq j \leq k$. It has at least one line segment. We say that a line segment $v_{i-1}v_i$ is *simple* if v_{i-1} and v_i are the only points on it with integer coordinates.

We now state the irreducibility criterion by Dumas, a proof of which can be found in [3, Sec. 2.2]. The original proof by Dumas appeared in 1906 in the paper [1].

> *Dumas criterion.* Let $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be a polynomial of positive degree. Suppose that there exists a prime p for which the Newton diagram of $f(x)$ consists of exactly one simple line segment. Then $f(x)$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Z}$.

Observe that if p satisfies the three conditions of Eisenstein criterion, then the Newton diagram of $f(x)$ with respect to p consists of one simple line segment with end vertices $(0, 1)$ and $(n, 0)$ and so $f(x)$ is irreducible. Thus Dumas criterion can be considered as a generalization of Eisenstein criterion.

Example 1.1. *The Newton diagram of $f(x) = x^4 + 12$ with respect to $p = 2$ consists of one line segment through the initial vertex $(0, 2)$ and the terminal vertex $(4, 0)$. It contains the point $(2, 1)$ with integer coordinates and so Dumas criterion can not be applied with respect to 2. However, $f(x)$ is Eisenstein for $p = 3$ and hence irreducible over $\mathbb{Z}$.*

Now let $f(x) = a_nx^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1x + a_0 \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$. Suppose that there exists a positive integer k and a prime number p such that

$$p \nmid a_n,\ p^k \mid a_j\ (0 \leq j \leq n-1) \text{ and } p^{k+1} \nmid a_0.$$

Then the Newton diagram of $f(x)$ with respect to p consists of exactly one line segment uv, where $u = (0, k)$ and $v = (n, 0)$. The equation of the line through u and v is

$$kX + nY = nk.$$

If k and n are relatively prime, then it can be seen that there is no integer coordinate points on the line segment uv different from u, v. So uv is a simple line segment and hence $f(x)$ is irreducible by Dumas criterion. Thus, we have the following result which is related to the question mentioned before.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $f(x) = a_nx^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1x + a_0 \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ and k be a positive integer relatively prime to n. Suppose that there exists a prime*

p such that $p \nmid a_n$, $p^k \mid a_j$ for $0 \le j \le n-1$ and $p^{k+1} \nmid a_0$. Then $f(x)$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Z}$.

For $k = 1$, Theorem 1.2 is simply Eisenstein criterion. The aim of this article is to give an elementary proof, which is accessible to the undergraduate students, of Theorem 1.2 for $k \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ using basic divisibility properties of integers. One can use similar argument for other small values of k, but more steps will be involved. For $k \ge 2$, it can be observed from the Newton diagram of $f(x)$ with respect to p that the condition $p^k \mid a_j$ for $0 \le j \le n-1$ is much stronger. It can further be relaxed for higher value of j. For example, for $k = 2$, this condition can be replaced by that $p \mid a_j$ for $j \le n-1$ and $p^2 \mid a_i$ for $0 \le i \le \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ (see Theorem 2.2).

2 For $k = 2$

We start with the following lemma which essentially proves the Eisenstein criterion, but stated in a different way as per our requirement. This result is useful in all the cases of $k \in \{2, 3, 4\}$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $f(x) = a_n x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0 \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$. Suppose that there exists a prime p such that $p \nmid a_n$ and $p \mid a_i$ for $0 \le i \le n-1$. If $f(x) = g(x)h(x)$ for two nonconstant polynomials $g(x)$, $h(x)$ in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$, then p divides all the coefficients, except the leading ones, of $g(x)$ and $h(x)$. In particular, if $p^2 \nmid a_0$, then $f(x)$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. Let $g(x) = b_k x^k + \cdots + b_1 x + b_0$ and $h(x) = c_l x^l + \cdots + c_1 x + c_0$, where $k, l \ge 1$. We first show that b_0 and c_0 are divisible by p. Since $a_n = b_k c_l$ and $p \nmid a_n$, we have $p \nmid b_k$ and $p \nmid c_l$. Since $a_0 = b_0 c_0$ and $p \mid a_0$, we have $p \mid b_0$ or $p \mid c_0$. We may assume that $p \mid b_0$. Let r, $1 \le r \le k$, be the smallest integer such that $p \nmid b_r$. Considering the coefficient a_r in $f(x)$, we have

$$a_r = b_r c_0 + b_{r-1} c_1 + \cdots + b_0 c_r.$$

Since $p \mid a_r$ and $p \mid b_i$ for $0 \le i \le r-1$, it follows that $p \mid b_r c_0$. Then $p \mid c_0$ as $p \nmid b_r$.

Now consider r as above and let s, $1 \le s \le l$, be the smallest integer such that $p \nmid c_s$. Considering the coefficient a_{r+s} in $f(x)$, we have

$$a_{r+s} = b_{r+s} c_0 + \cdots + b_{r+1} c_{s-1} + b_r c_s + b_{r-1} c_{s+1} + \cdots + b_0 c_{r+s}.$$

Note that $p \nmid b_r c_s$ and all the remaining terms in the above expression of a_{r+s} are divisible by p. So $p \nmid a_{r+s}$. Since $p \mid a_i$ for $0 \le i \le n-1$, we get $a_{r+s} = a_n = a_{k+l}$. So $r = k$ and $s = l$. □

We now prove the following result which is an improved version of Theorem 1.2 for $k = 2$.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $f(x) = a_n x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0 \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$. Suppose that there exists a prime p such that $p \nmid a_n$, $p \mid a_i$ for $i \leq n-1$, $p^2 \mid a_j$ for $j \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ and $p^3 \nmid a_0$. Then the following hold:*

(1) If n is odd, then $f(x)$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Z}$.

(2) If n is even, then either $f(x)$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Z}$, or $f(x)$ is a product of exactly two irreducible polynomials in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ of equal degree which are Eisenstein with respect to p.

Proof. Suppose that $f(x) = g(x)h(x)$ for some nonconstant polynomials $g(x), h(x)$ in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$, where

$$g(x) = b_r x^r + b_{r-1}x^{r-1} + \cdots + b_1 x + b_0,$$
$$h(x) = c_s x^s + c_{s-1}x^{s-1} + \cdots + c_1 x + c_0.$$

Since $p \nmid a_n$, we have $p \nmid b_r$ and $p \nmid c_s$. By Lemma 2.1, b_i and c_j are divisible by p for $0 \leq i \leq r-1$ and $0 \leq j \leq s-1$. Since $p^3 \nmid a_0$, we have $p^2 \nmid b_0$ and $p^2 \nmid c_0$. Thus $g(x)$ and $h(x)$ both are Eisenstein with respect to p and hence irreducible over $\mathbb{Z}$. In order to complete the proof, it is enough to show that $r = s$.

First suppose that $r > s$. We shall get a contradiction by showing that $p \mid c_s$. Considering the coefficient a_s in $f(x)$, we have

$$a_s = b_s c_0 + b_{s-1}c_1 + \cdots + b_1 c_{s-1} + b_0 c_s.$$

Since $r > s$, each term in the above expression of a_s, different from $b_0 c_s$, is divisible by p^2. Also, $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor = \lfloor (r+s)/2 \rfloor \geq s$ implies that $p^2 \mid a_s$. Then it follows that $p^2 \mid b_0 c_s$. Since $p^2 \nmid b_0$, we get $p \mid c_s$, a contradiction. If $s > r$, then similar argument holds to get a contradiction that $p \mid b_r$. □

We give examples below to show that both the possibilities in Theorem 2.2 may occur for even degree polynomials in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$.

Example 2.3. *(1) For any prime p, the polynomial $f(x) = x^2 + p^2 \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ satisfies the conditions of Theorem 2.2 with respect to p. So it is irreducible over $\mathbb{Z}$.*

(2) The polynomial $f(x) = x^4 + 5x^3 + 25x^2 + 50x + 150$ satisfies the conditions of Theorem 2.2 with $p = 5$. But it is reducible over $\mathbb{Z}$, as $f(x) = (x^2 + 10)(x^2 + 5x + 15)$.

3 For $k = 3$

The following elementary result is useful for us. We include a proof of it for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 3.1. *Let p be a prime and u, v be integers which are not divisible by p. If $p \mid xy$ and $p \mid (ux + vy)$ for some integers x and y, then $p \mid x$ and $p \mid y$.*

Proof. Since p is a prime and $p \mid xy$, we have $p \mid x$ or $p \mid y$. Assume that $p \mid x$. Then $p \mid (ux + vy)$ implies that $p \mid vy$. Then $p \mid y$ as $p \nmid v$. □

Theorem 3.2. *Let $f(x) = a_n x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0 \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$, where n is not divisible by 3. Suppose that there exists a prime p such that the leading coefficient a_n is not divisible by p, the remaining coefficients are divisible by p^3 and the constant term a_0 is not divisible by p^4. Then $f(x)$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $f(x)$ is reducible over $\mathbb{Z}$. Let $f(x) = g(x)h(x)$ for some nonconstant polynomials $g(x), h(x)$ in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$, where

$$g(x) = b_r x^r + b_{r-1}x^{r-1} + \cdots + b_1 x + b_0,$$
$$h(x) = c_s x^s + c_{s-1}x^{s-1} + \cdots + c_1 x + c_0.$$

Since $p \nmid a_n$, $p \nmid b_r$ and $p \nmid c_s$. By Lemma 2.1, $p \mid b_i$ for $0 \le i \le r-1$ and $p \mid c_j$ for $0 \le j \le s-1$. Since $p^3 \mid a_0$ and $p^4 \nmid a_0$, either $b_0 = up^2$ and $c_0 = vp$, or $b_0 = up$ and $c_0 = vp^2$ for some integers u, v which are not divisible by p. Without loss, we may assume that $b_0 = up^2$ and $c_0 = vp$.

Claim 3.2.1. *$r > s$.*

On the contrary, suppose that $s \ge r$. Considering the coefficient a_r in $f(x)$, we have

$$b_r vp + b_{r-1}c_1 + \cdots + b_1 c_{r-1} + c_r up^2 = a_r \equiv 0 \mod p^2.$$

Since b_i and c_i are divisible by p for $1 \le i \le r-1$, it follows that $p^2 \mid b_r vp$. Then $p \nmid v$ implies that $p \mid b_r$, a contradiction.

Claim 3.2.2. *$p^2 \mid b_l$ for $0 \le l \le s-1$.*

We shall prove by induction on l. This is clear for $l = 0$, since $b_0 = up^2$. So assume that $1 \le l \le s-1$ and that $p^2 \mid b_i$ for $0 \le i \le l-1$. The coefficient a_l in $f(x)$ is divisible by p^3 and so

$$b_l vp + b_{l-1}c_1 + \cdots + b_1 c_{l-1} + c_l up^2 \equiv 0 \mod p^3.$$

Using the induction hypothesis and the fact that $p \mid c_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq l$, it follows that $p^3 \mid b_l vp$. Then $p \nmid v$ implies that $p^2 \mid b_l$.

Claim 3.2.3. *$r \geq 2s$.*

Suppose that $r \leq 2s-1$. Since the coefficient a_r in $f(x)$ is divisible by p^2, we have

$$b_r vp + b_{r-1}c_1 + \cdots + b_{r-s+1}c_{s-1} + b_{r-s}c_s \equiv 0 \mod p^2.$$

Note that $r - s \leq s - 1$ as $r \leq 2s-1$ by our assumption, and so $p^2 \mid b_{r-s}$ by Claim 3.2.2. Since $p \mid c_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq s-1$ and $p \mid b_j$ for $j \leq r-1$, it follows that $p^2 \mid b_r vp$. Then $p \nmid v$ implies that $p \mid b_r$, a contradiction.

Claim 3.2.4. *$r \geq 2s+1$.*

By Claim 3.2.3, we have $r \geq 2s$. Since $n = r + s$, the hypothesis that $3 \nmid n$ implies $r \neq 2s$. So $r \geq 2s+1$.

Now the coefficient $a_s = b_s vp + b_{s-1}c_1 + \cdots + b_1 c_{s-1} + c_s up^2$ of x^s in $f(x)$ is divisible by p^3. Using Claim 3.2.2, it follows that

$$\bar{b}_s v + c_s u \equiv 0 \mod p, \tag{1}$$

where $b_s = \bar{b}_s p$. Considering the coefficient a_{2s} of x^{2s} in $f(x)$ which is divisible by p^2, we have

$$b_{2s} vp + b_{2s-1}c_1 + \cdots + b_{s+1}c_{s-1} + b_s c_s \equiv 0 \mod p^2.$$

Note that $p \mid b_j$ for $j \leq 2s$ as $r \geq 2s+1$. It follows that $b_s c_s$ is divisible by p^2 and this gives

$$\bar{b}_s c_s \equiv 0 \mod p. \tag{2}$$

Then the congruence relations (1), (2) and Lemma 3.1 together imply that $p \mid c_s$, a final contradiction to our assumption that $f(x)$ is reducible. This completes the proof. □

4 For $k = 4$

Theorem 4.1. *Let $f(x) = a_n x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0 \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$, where n and 4 are relatively prime. Suppose that there exists a prime p such that the leading coefficient a_n is not divisible by p, the remaining coefficients are divisible by p^4 and the constant term a_0 is not divisible by p^5. Then $f(x)$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $f(x)$ is reducible over $\mathbb{Z}$. Let $f(x) = g(x)h(x)$ for some nonconstant polynomials $g(x), h(x)$ in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$, where

$$g(x) = b_r x^r + b_{r-1}x^{r-1} + \cdots + b_1 x + b_0,$$
$$h(x) = c_s x^s + c_{s-1}x^{s-1} + \cdots + c_1 x + c_0.$$

Then $p \nmid b_r$ and $p \nmid c_s$, since $p \nmid a_n$. By Lemma 2.1, $p \mid b_i$ for $0 \leq i \leq r-1$ and $p \mid c_j$ for $0 \leq j \leq s-1$. Since $p^4 \mid a_0$ and $p^5 \nmid a_0$, we have the following cases for some integers u, v which are not divisible by p:

(1) either $b_0 = up^3$ and $c_0 = vp$, or $b_0 = up$ and $c_0 = vp^3$.

(2) $b_0 = up^2$ and $c_0 = vp^2$.

Case-(1). Without loss, we may assume that $b_0 = up^3$ and $c_0 = vp$. Applying the argument as in the proof of Claim 3.2.1, we get $r > s$. Then applying similar arguments as in the proof of Claims 3.2.2 and 3.2.3, we have the following facts:

$$p^3 \mid b_l \text{ for } 0 \leq l \leq s-1 \text{ and } r \geq 2s.$$

The coefficient $a_s = b_s vp + b_{s-1}c_1 + \cdots + b_1 c_{s-1} + c_s up^3$ in $f(x)$ is divisible by p^4. It follows that $p^2 \mid b_s$ and that

$$\bar{b}_s v + c_s u \equiv 0 \mod p, \tag{3}$$

where $b_s = \bar{b}_s p^2$. Since $p \nmid u$ and $p \nmid c_s$, (3) implies that $p \nmid \bar{b}_s$.

Claim 4.1.1. *$p^2 \mid b_{s+t}$ for $0 \leq t \leq s-1$.*

We prove this by induction on t. For $t = 0$, we have obtained above that $p^2 \mid b_s$. So assume that $1 \leq t \leq s-1$ and that $p^2 \mid b_{s+i}$ for $0 \leq i \leq t-1$. We have

$$a_{s+t} = b_{s+t}vp + b_{s+t-1}c_1 + \cdots + b_{t+1}c_{s-1} + b_t c_s.$$

Note that b_t is divisible by p^3 as $t \leq s-1$. Using the induction hypotheses, it follows that all the terms, different from the first one, in the above expression of a_{s+t} are divisible by p^3. Since $p^3 \mid a_{s+t}$, we get $p^3 \mid b_{s+t}vp$ and so $p^2 \mid b_{s+t}$ as $p \nmid v$.

Claim 4.1.2. *$r \geq 3s+1$.*

First suppose that $r \leq 3s-1$. Considering the coefficient a_r of x^r in $f(x)$ which is divisible by p^2, we have

$$b_r vp + b_{r-1}c_1 + \cdots + b_{r-s+1}c_{s-1} + b_{r-s}c_s \equiv 0 \mod p^2.$$

Note that $r-s \leq 2s-1$ as $r \leq 3s-1$ by our assumption, and so $p^2 \mid b_{r-s}$ by Claim 4.1.1. Since $p \mid c_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq s-1$ and $p \mid b_j$ for $j \leq r-1$, it follows that $p^2 \mid b_r vp$. Then $p \nmid v$ implies $p \mid b_r$, a contradiction. Thus $r \geq 3s$. Since $n = r+s$, and 4 and n are relatively prime, we get $r \geq 3s+1$.

The coefficient $a_{2s} = b_{2s}vp + b_{2s-1}c_1 + \cdots + b_{s+1}c_{s-1} + b_s c_s$ of x^{2s} in $f(x)$ is divisible by p^3. Using Claim 4.1.1, it follows that

$$\bar{b}_{2s}v + \bar{b}_s c_s \equiv 0 \mod p, \tag{4}$$

where $b_{2s} = \bar{b}_{2s}p$ and $\bar{b}_s$ is as before. Considering the coefficient a_{3s} in $f(x)$ which is divisible by p^2, we have

$$b_{3s}vp + b_{3s-1}c_1 + \cdots + b_{2s+1}c_{s-1} + b_{2s}c_s \equiv 0 \mod p^2.$$

Note that $p \mid b_j$ for $j \leq 3s$ as $r \geq 3s+1$. It follows that $b_{2s}c_s$ is divisible by p^2 and this gives

$$\bar{b}_{2s}c_s \equiv 0 \mod p. \tag{5}$$

Since $p \nmid v$ and $p \nmid \bar{b}_s$, Lemma 3.1 applying to the congruence relations (4) and (5) gives $p \mid c_s$, a contradiction. This completes the proof of Case-(1).

Case-(2). Here $b_0 = up^2$ and $c_0 = vp^2$. Without loss, we may assume that $r \geq s$. Since 4 and n are relatively prime, we must have $r > s$.

Claim 4.1.3. *b_l and c_l are divisible by p^2 for $0 \leq l \leq \lfloor (s-1)/2 \rfloor$.*

We shall prove by induction on l. This is clear for $l = 0$, since $b_0 = up^2$ and $c_0 = vp^2$. So assume that $1 \leq l \leq \lfloor (s-1)/2 \rfloor$ and that b_i, c_i are divisible by p^2 for $0 \leq i \leq l-1$. The coefficient a_l in $f(x)$ is divisible by p^4 and so

$$b_l vp^2 + b_{l-1}c_1 + \cdots + b_1 c_{l-1} + c_l up^2 \equiv 0 \mod p^4.$$

Using the induction hypothesis, we get

$$\bar{b}_l v + \bar{c}_l u \equiv 0 \mod p, \tag{6}$$

where $b_l = \bar{b}_l p$ and $c_l = \bar{c}_l p$. For the coefficient a_{2l} in $f(x)$, we have

$$a_{2l} = b_{2l}vp^2 + b_{2l-1}c_1 + \cdots + b_{l+1}c_{l-1} + b_l c_l + b_{l-1}c_{l+1} + \cdots + b_1 c_{2l-1} + c_{2l}up^2.$$

Since $a_{2l} \equiv 0 \mod p^3$, again using the induction hypothesis, it follows that

$$\bar{b}_l \bar{c}_l \equiv 0 \mod p. \tag{7}$$

Then (6), (7) and Lemma 3.1 together imply that $p \mid \bar{b}_l$ and $p \mid \bar{c}_l$ and so the claim follows.

If s is odd, say $s = 2k+1$ for some k, then $\lfloor (s-1)/2 \rfloor = k$. Considering the coefficient $a_s = a_{2k+1}$ in $f(x)$, we have

$$b_{2k+1}vp^2 + b_{2k}c_1 + \cdots + b_{k+1}c_k + b_kc_{k+1} + \cdots + b_1c_{2k} + c_{2k+1}up^2 \equiv 0 \mod p^3.$$

This gives $p \mid c_{2k+1}$, that is, $p \mid c_s$, a contradiction.

If s is even, say $s = 2k$ for some k, then $\lfloor (s-1)/2 \rfloor = k-1$. For the coefficient $a_s = a_{2k}$ in $f(x)$, we have

$$a_{2k} = b_{2k}vp^2 + b_{2k-1}c_1 + \cdots + b_{k+1}c_{k-1} + b_kc_k + b_{k-1}c_{k+1} + \cdots + b_1c_{2k-1} + c_{2k}up^2.$$

Since $r \geq s+1 = 2k+1$ and $a_s = a_{2k} \equiv 0 \mod p^3$, it follows that

$$\bar{b}_k\bar{c}_k + c_{2k}u \equiv 0 \mod p, \tag{8}$$

where $b_k = \bar{b}_k p$ and $c_k = \bar{c}_k p$. Now, for the coefficient a_{3k} in $f(x)$, we have

$$a_{3k} = b_{3k}vp^2 + b_{3k-1}c_1 + \cdots + b_{2k+1}c_{k-1} + b_{2k}c_k + \cdots + b_{k+1}c_{2k-1} + b_kc_{2k}.$$

Each term, different from the last one, in the above expression is divisible by p^2. Since $a_{3k} \equiv 0 \mod p^2$, we get $p^2 \mid b_kc_{2k}$ and so

$$\bar{b}_kc_{2k} \equiv 0 \mod p. \tag{9}$$

Then, as $p \nmid u$, the congruence relations (8) and (9) give $p \mid c_{2k}$, that is, $p \mid c_s$, a contradiction. This completes the proof. □

References

[1] Dumas, G., *Sur quelques cas d'irréductibilité des polynomes à coefficients rationnels*, J. Math. Pure Appl. **2** (1906), 191–258.

[2] Oleinikov, V. A., *Irreducibility and irrationality* [Kvant 1986, no. 11, 12–16]. Kvant selecta: algebra and analysis, II, 95–103, Math. World, 15, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999.

[3] Prasolov, V. V., *Polynomials*, Translated from the 2001 Russian second edition by Dimitry Leites, Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics, 11 Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010.

[4] Sury, B., *Polynomials with integer values*, Resonance **6** (9) (2001), 46–60.